

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended, and claims 1, 3, and 5-13 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:**

Claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent 7,178,106). The applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites wherein, when a second event occurs, the ENAV engine refrains from informing the AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event based on second event information recorded in the markup document. In maintaining the rejection, the Examiner construes the second event recited in claim 1 as corresponding to when the video is not playing in a full-screen mode. In this situation, Lamkin discloses that the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation (col. 19, lines 51-54). Lamkin, however, does not disclose how the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation. Lamkin does not disclose whether the embedded web browser 410 (or the other components that the Examiner construes as corresponding to the ENAV engine) prevents the navigation buttons from working by failing to transmit corresponding commands to the DVD navigator 422 (which the Examiner construes as part of the AV playback engine recited in claim 1) or whether the DVD navigator 422 prevents the navigation buttons from working. It would be entirely consistent with Lamkin's disclosure for the DVD navigator 422 to receive input from the navigation button, determine that video is not playing in full-screen mode, and then fail to perform the appropriate navigation command. Indeed, Lamkin expressly discloses that input from the user remote control 730 is received by the DVD navigator 422 (shown by the arrow in FIG. 7; see also col. 11, lines 37-39). There is no component between the DVD navigator 422 and the user remote control 730 to prevent input from the user remote control 730 from being received by the DVD navigator 422. This suggests that the DVD navigator 422 will always be informed of key input events, even if the navigation buttons will not always work for DVD navigation. Lamkin therefore does not disclose wherein the ENAV engine refrains from informing the AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event, as recited in claim 1.

In addition Lamkin also fails to disclose that the ENAV engine refrains from informing the

AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event based on second event information recorded in the markup document. Lamkin discloses that the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation unless video is playing in full-screen mode. Lamkin does not indicate how this operation is performed or that this feature of the full-screen video mode is activated based on second event information recorded in the markup document. The disclosure suggests that the button disabling feature will always be present during the full-screen video mode, not that the feature can be triggered based on second event information included in the markup document. Lamkin provides an extensive listing of commands that can be included in a markup document, but none of these commands corresponds to the navigation button disabling feature disclosed at col. 19, lines 51-54. Lamkin thus does not disclose wherein the ENAV engine refrains from informing the AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event based on second event information recorded in the markup document. Accordingly, Lamkin does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-7 depend from claim 1. The rejection of claims 3-7 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent 7,178,106) in view of Kanazawa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,580,870). Claim 8 recites limitations similar to claim 1, such as wherein the ENAV engine allows the key input event signal to occur using first event information written in the markup document, which includes event registration information to check whether the user performed the action, and when a second event occurs, the ENAV engine refrains from informing the AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event based on second event information recorded in the markup document. Lamkin does not disclose this limitation for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, and Kanazawa does not remedy this deficiency. Accordingly, the combination of Lamkin and Kanazawa, even if proper, does not disclose or suggest all the limitations of claim 8, and the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

Claims 9-13 depend from claim 8. The rejection of claims 9-13 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 8.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 9/12/08

1400 Eye St., NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510

By: G. Clinton

Gregory L. Clinton  
Registration No. 59,134